

Contributions

HONEST MONEY

C. H. WETHERBE

Under such a heading Rev. L. A. Banks says: "A bankrupt and disgraced promoter of fraudulent schemes, during the days of his seeming prosperity and while he was making lavish displays of great wealth, presented the famous cathedral of St. Paul in London with a communion service of solid gold, which cost \$125,000. Since then it has come to be known that this man was a shameless fraud and that his money was filched from his dupes by cunning schemes. The trustees of the cathedral have, with a commendable sense of honor, returned the full cost of the communion service received by them to the scoundrels creditors; in that way they have kept their hands clean and stainless. It would hasten the coming of the reign of Christ on earth if every Christian business man would thus hold himself clear of every possible connection with dishonest money."

In such a case as the one referred to I think that those trustees did rightly. There are cases, however, in which it is very difficult for those who have become the beneficiaries of money which has been dishonestly gained, to determine their duty in the matter. Money sometimes comes into the hands of pastors and churches which, it is pretty evident, was gotten by the givers, if not directly dishonestly, yet in some disreputable manner. Some pastors as well as others declare that it is wrong to receive for their support or for the support of the church any money which has been obtained by the givers by selling intoxicating liquors. Some pastors say that they will not, knowingly, receive such money. I see no reason for objecting to receiving money thus obtained. One does not sanction intemperance in so doing, nor does one countenance the liquor seller by accepting his money. It would be just as reasonable for one, who strongly opposes the use of tobacco, to say that he will not accept as a gift the money which a merchant, who sells it, offers to him as to say that he will not accept the money which is obtained by liquor-selling. At the same time, one has no right to accept, as a free gift, a sum of money which he knows has been stolen.

THE LORD'S SUPPER No. 8

G. W. RENCH

When is it to be observed? There has been so much said and written on this subject that it would seem futile for me to say anything. Yet I do not know that which I shall say has ever been said. The world has not gained much if it has been, neither will it cause much commotion to repeat it.

My first argument is drawn from the meaning of the word *supper*. The literature of the age of Christ and the apostles as well as the literature of the Bible points to the fact that *supper* is the evening meal. Not the morning meal, nor the noonday meal, but the evening meal. The only place in God's word where this ordinance is mentioned the word *supper* is used to express the idea instead of *dinner* or *feast*. Why did the Holy Spirit pass over the word *dinner* and even the more general word *feast* and select the word *supper* if time has nothing to do with the proper observance of this service? I have already told you how that Dr. Seiss charges inconsistency on all who build a practice on the meaning of the word "baptisma" and then reject the meaning of "diepnon." He says, "Time and an abundance of provisions are as necessarily included in "diepnon" (meaning supper) as it is possible for mode to be in "baptisma;" and when he gives the warrant for his liberty to eject time from the Lord's Supper, and for his substitution of a little fragment of bread and a little sip of wine for a full meal, we shall be prepared to establish our right to dispense with his favorite mode in the administration of baptism." But what fault could he find with a people who accept the full meaning of both terms as the Brethren do? I quote this to show you that scholars admit that the word *supper* means time as well as quantity of food. Space will not permit my using a number of quotations from the literature of the times showing that the accepted meaning of "diepnon" was an evening repast. If you doubt what I say write me.

My next argument is drawn from the practice of Christ and the apostles. Matt. 26: 20. Now when even was come he was sitting at meat with the twelve disciples; and as they were eating, he said, Verily I say unto you that one of you shall betray me. John 13: 30. He then having received the sop went out straightway: and it was night. What evening or night was this? Being the night of the betrayal it was, of course, the night of the last supper, because it was at the table where the betrayer, Judas, was pointed out. In a former paper we proved that Jesus and his apostles ate this last supper on Thursday evening. No one disputes this fact. The Lord's Supper, therefore, was instituted by the great Head of the church on this evening. "Is that the proper time for its observance?" says one. Well, so far as the example of Jesus is a precedent Thursday night would be all right. It was certainly an eventful night. Feet washing, the Lord's Supper, the communion, the agony in the garden, and the betrayal all coming in this night makes it one not easily forgotten by the Lord's followers. In the absence of a

command either by Jesus or the apostles as to what night we should observe the Lord's Supper, Thursday night is certainly as good as any. Is it any better than other nights? I do not think so. If I should be compelled to take a stand for one night out of the seven I would take Thursday night because it was instituted on that night. But if the example of Jesus is good in one particular it is good in another. And since Jesus left this matter entirely with his followers let us follow his example and do likewise.

Says one, "Did not the apostles meet on the first day of the week to break bread?" Let us see. Acts 21: 7. And upon the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread, Paul discoursed with them, intending to depart on the morrow; and prolonged his speech until midnight. The Disciple church founds its practice of Lord's Day communion on this verse. It says that this day is the only proper time for this service. Now, I do not object to appropriating Sunday evening to this service but I do object to making this the only time for its scriptural observance. Take away all the facts in connection with this meeting at Troas and give those who hold that the Lord's Day is the only day on which we can meet to break bread all the strength that the verse contains to support them and they have nothing but *example to stand upon*. But they don't like *example* when it comes to what Jesus and the apostles did the night in which he was betrayed. They reject both feet washing and the Supper because they say there is no command for either; that the verbs "ought" and "should" which Jesus used are not in the imperative mood. But what do they here? Found a practice of their whole church upon nothing but example—admitting that it is example! But our advocates of communing on the Lord's Day do not follow the example, even of the apostles at this Troas meeting. The apostle's meaning must be interpreted by their practice. Certainly they would not teach a certain day for observing the communion and then violate their teaching by their practice. This scripture is one of the strongest testimonies in favor of following the Lord in his example. Read the verse again and note (1) that this meeting at Troas was a *night service*. Paul "prolonged his speech until midnight." So was the Lord's meeting a night service. So are our meetings to "break bread." So far we not only follow the Lord but we follow these apostles. The word "supper" could be used without being inconsistent in reference to the Lord's meeting, the meeting of the apostles and brethren at Troas, and to the meeting of the brethren now. If the apostles, therefore, broke bread on